

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

_____	)	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	)	
	)	
V.	)	NO. 09-CR-10017-GAO
	)	
TAREK MEHANNA	)	
_____	)	

DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR JUDGMENT OF ACQUITTAL AT THE CLOSE OF THE  
GOVERNMENT'S CASE

I. Introduction

The defendant, Tarek Mehanna, moves under Rule 29(a) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure that this Court grant him a judgment of acquittal on all charges against him.

II. Standard

Pursuant to Rule 29(a), the defendant may move for a judgment of acquittal at the close of the government's case. Fed. Rule Crim. Pro. 29(a). Rule 29(a) provides, in pertinent part, that "the court on the defendant's motion must enter a judgment of acquittal of any offense for which the evidence is insufficient to sustain a conviction." The First Circuit has defined the legal standard for such a motion as follows:

A motion for judgment of acquittal is only granted if the evidence and all reasonable inferences to be drawn from the evidence, both taken in the light most favorable to the government, are insufficient for a rational factfinder to conclude that the prosecution has proven, beyond a reasonable doubt, each of the elements of the offense.

United States v. Upton, 559 F.3d 3, 10 (1st Cir. 2009) (quoting United States v. Pimental, 380 F.3d 575, 583 (1st Cir. 2004) (internal quotations omitted)).

### III. Charges

The defendant faces the following seven charges:

Count 1: Conspiracy to Provide Material Support or Resources to a Designated Foreign Terrorist Organization in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2339B;

Count 2: Conspiracy to Provide Material Support to Terrorists in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2339A;

Count 3: Providing and Attempting to Provide Material Support to Terrorists in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2339A;

Count 4: Conspiracy to Kill in a Foreign Country in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 956;

Count 5: Conspiracy to make false statements under 18 U.S.C. § 1001, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 371;

Count 6: False Statements in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1001(a)(2); and

Count 7: False Statements in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1001(a)(2).

### IV. Argument

The defendant submits that the government has not produced sufficient evidence to prove beyond a reasonable doubt each element of each of the above offenses.

The defendant also renews all claims presented in his previous written and oral motions, including but not limited to, claims raising First Amendment, vagueness, overbreadth, due process, scope of the conspiracy, and variance objections. Any argument on this motion does not waive any of these claims.

TAREK MEHANNA  
By his attorneys,

CARNEY & BASSIL

/S/ J. W. Carney, Jr.  
J. W. Carney, Jr.  
B.B.O. # 074760

/S/ Janice Bassil  
Janice Bassil  
B.B.O. # 033100

Sejal H. Patel  
B.B.O. # 662259  
Steven R. Morrison  
B.B.O. # 669533  
John E. Oh  
B.B.O. # 675916  
Carney & Bassil  
20 Park Plaza, Suite 1405  
Boston, MA 02116  
617-338-5566

Dated: December 5, 2011

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that this document filed through the ECF system will be sent electronically to the registered participants as identified on the Notice of Electronic Filing (NEF) and paper copies will be sent to those indicated as non-registered participants on or before the above date.

/S/J. W. Carney, Jr.  
J. W. Carney, Jr.